

IV. REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the postal data elements are 2-dimensional bar codes and that the first and second elements are separated by a delimiter. Similar limitations have been added to claims 7, 13, 20 and 40. While Figs. 6 and 7 of Schwartz show plain-text elements 605 and 705 respectively separated from barcode elements 610 and 710, there is no separation of first and second bar code elements as presently claimed.

Claim 26 covers the prediction embodiment, e.g., using past usage of mail class and postage and the most likely class and postage. While it is true, as stated by the Examiner, that Schwartz discloses storage of a table of rates and postage, it is respectfully submitted that this storage is not determining first data based on a predicted version of second data as claimed. In other words, storage is not the same as prediction. Further, since there is no predicted data, there can be no comparator for comparing actual data with the predicted data as is also claimed. In fact, there is no comparison of any kind in Schwartz. If the Examiner is unconvinced, he is asked to point out where in Schwartz there is a comparator.

Thus the rejection of claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, 17-21, 24-33 and 89-102 under 35 USC 102 on Schwartz should be withdrawn.

Further, since there is not the slightest suggestion in Schwartz of breaking up bar code elements 610 and 710 by a delimiter, or of prediction and comparison, with the advantages of speed, avoiding multiple passes, efficient generation of error correction codes, and efficient use of space, these claims are unobvious over it.

As previously pointed out, claim 40 now recites a 2-dimensional bar code segments separated by a delimiter. Gilham '903 totally fails to disclose this.

Thus the rejection of claims 40-43, and 106 under 35 USC 102 on Gilham should be withdrawn.

Further, since Gilham totally fails to suggest this feature, these claims are unobvious over it.

Similarly, Emmett fails to disclose this feature. Thus the rejection of claims 40 and 44 under 35 USC 102 on Emmett should be withdrawn.

Further, since there is no suggestion in Emmett of this feature, these claims are unobvious over it.

The remaining claims have either been cancelled or withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.